## REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-21 remain pending in the present patent application.  No amendments to the claims are presented herein, where the listing of claims is provided for the sake of convenience.  Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,931,447 issued to Hemstreet et al. (hereafter "*Hemstreet*").  Anticipation under §102 "requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction." W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).  For the reasons that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-21 be withdrawn.

To begin, clam 1 as originally filed states as follows:

> 1.      A method for remotely monitoring a printer status, comprising the steps of:
> selecting a printer status object from among a list of selectable printer status objects in a remote client in data communication with a printer;
> generating an email in the remote client;
> writing a status request into the email in a printer management language native to the printer, the status request requesting a current status of the printer status object in the printer;
> transmitting the email to the printer; and
> receiving a reply email from the printer that includes the current status of the printer status object in the printer, the current status being expressed in the printer management language native to the printer.

As set forth above, claim 1 specifies the step of selecting a printer status object from among a list of selectable printer status objects in a remote client in data communication with a printer.  In this respect, a number of printer status objects exist within the remote client and the user may select among those objects.  Thereafter, an e-mail is generated in the remote client and a status request is written into the e-mail in a printer management language that is native to the printer.  The status request requests a current status of the printer status object in the printer.  The printer status object is written into the request in the printer management language native to the printer so the

printer can understand the printer request itself. Ultimately, the e-mail is transmitted to the printer and a reply e-mail is received from the printer that includes the current status of the printer status object associated with the printer. The status is expressed in the printer management language native to the printer which eliminates the need for translation at a printer level.

*Hemstreet* describes a system for providing information about the operation of a printer. To this end, *Hemstreet* does mention the concept of sending an e-mail to a printer and receiving a reply with the status information. In addition, with respect to FIG. 2, *Hemstreet* describes gaining access to a web page associated with a printer in order to specify notification recipients of status e-mails that the printer automatically generates when status events occur such as, for example, low ink, out of paper, door open, or other events. In particular, when status events occur in the printer, the printer automatically sends e-mails indicating the status event to the respective recipients specified by the fields of the user interface depicted in FIG. 2.

However, *Hemstreet* fails to show or suggest the concept of selecting in one of the clients 111 a printer status object from a list of selectable printer status objects in order to obtain status information from the printer. To this end, it appears that *Hemstreet* vaguely describes the concept of sending a request for status to a printer without defining how that is implemented beyond mentioning that a protocol is used.

The various embodiment of the present invention provide for much greater granularity in determining the functional operation of a printer remotely by information technology administrators. In particular, the list of objects relates to the management information database (MIB) associated with the printer that lists the printer status objects as well as the present status of the printer status objects in the printer itself. In addition, claim 1 further specifies that the status request is embodied in a printer management language that is recognizable by the printer. This allows the printer to respond to requests without reprogramming the printer to recognize user friendly terminology in status request, *etc*.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that *Hemstreet* fails to show or suggest the elements of claim 1.

In addition, claim 2 recites as follows:

2.      The method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:
generating an initial email in the remote client;
writing a request for the list of selectable printer status
objects into the initial email;
receiving an initial reply email from the printer, the initial
reply including the list of selectable printer status objects; and
parsing the initial reply email to obtain the list of selectable
printer status objects from the initial reply email.

With respect to claim 2, the Office Action states as follows:

Regarding claim 2, Hemstreet further discloses the method of claim 1,
further comprising the steps of:

- generating an initial email in the remote client (fig. 1a and fig. 2, col. 8,
  lines 16-60);
- writing a request for the list of selectable printer status objects (e.g. fig.
  2) into the initial email;
- receiving an initial reply email (fig. 2-3) from the printer, the initial reply
  including the list of selectable printer status objects; and
- parsing the initial reply email to obtain the list of selectable printer
  status objects (fig. 2-3) from the initial reply email.

Office Action, page 3.

Applicants respectfully disagree. While *Hemstreet* does describe generating

emails at a remote client, *Hemstreet* fails to show or suggest the concept of writing a

request for a list of selectable printer status objects into the e-mail and receiving a reply

with the list of selectable printer status objects from the printer. In particular, FIGS. 2

and 3 do not have a list of selectable printer status objects that are written to an e-mail.

FIG. 2 shows a web page that is generated by using browser access to a printer, and

has nothing to do with an e-mail. In this web page, various e-mail addresses can be

identified so that various status events associated with the printer can be communicated

to the respective e-mail addresses as selected. However, a user interface that is

generated using a browser does not equate to a request for a list of selectable printer

status objects that is written into an e-mail. Also, the e-mail received from a printer

indicating that it is out of ink as depicted in FIG. 3 is not a list of selectable printer status

objects. In this respect, precisely what in FIG. 3 is to be selected?

As set forth in claim 2, an initial e-mail is generated in the same remote client as

described in claim 1 that includes a request for a list of selectable printer status objects.

This functionality provides the remote client with a list of printer status objects from which the user may select in order to obtain the status of the respective objects. The nebulous reference to generating a status request e-mail by *Hemstreet* does not specifically describe the concept of requesting the printer status objects from the printer. The user may not specifically request the various types of status or printer status objects for which a status is to be obtained from the respective printer. In this respect, the user can specify with much greater particularity the type of status they wish to obtain from the printer, as it may be the case that other status elements are unnecessary or not pertinent to the need for knowledge of a given user at a given time.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that *Hemstreet* fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claim 2.

In addition, claim 3 recites as follows:

> 3.      The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of obtaining the list of selectable printer status objects from a server in data communication with the remote client.

As set forth above, claim 3 specifies the step of obtaining a list of selectable printer status objects from a server in data communication from a remote client. The remote client obtains the list of printer status objects from a central server 109 as opposed to the printer itself. The central server acts as a clearinghouse for such information for various types of printers. As such, the central server must be created in order to interface with the remote client printer management system 133 as described in the specification. This facilitates the remote control of printers by information technology administrators in various organizations. The use of the central server 109 is also important as it allows greater continuity to receive the needed printer status objects so that the remote client can obtain such information without having to resort to requesting directly from the printer, where the printer might be unable to provide such information. Applicant asserts that *Hemstreet* fails to show or suggest the elements of claim 3. The mere fact that the server 107 is embedded in the printer 105 of *Hemstreet* as set forth in the Office Action does not mean that the server is configured to provide a list of selectable printer objects to the remote client as set forth in claim 3. Accordingly,

Applicants assert that *Hemstreet* fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claim 3.

In addition, claims 7 and 8 recite as follows:

> 7.    The method of claim 6, wherein the step of displaying the list of selectable printer status objects on the display device further comprises the step of displaying a name of each of the printer status objects in the printer management language native to the printer.

> 8.    The method of claim 6, wherein the step of displaying the list of selectable printer status objects on the display device further comprises the steps of:
> mapping a name of each the selectable printer status objects expressed in the printer management language native to the printer to a corresponding user friendly name; and
> displaying the corresponding user friendly name for each of the selectable printer status objects.

Applicants assert that *Hemstreet* is silent as to the nature of how printer status objects are displayed. In particular, the printer status objects may be displayed in the printer management language native to the printer or by using friendly names that are associated with the names as expressed in the printer management language native to the printer. In this respect, an IT administrator can see the list of objects both as they are selected so as to request a status information from a printer and as the status information is ultimately displayed after the reply is received from the printer. With respect to claims 7 and 8, the Office Action states as follows:

> Regarding claim 7, Hemstreet further discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the step of displaying the list of selectable printer status objects on the display device further comprises the step of displaying a name (e.g. fig. 3) of each of the printer status objects in the printer management language native to the printer.

> Regarding claim 8, Hemstreet further discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the step of displaying the list of selectable printer status objects on the display device further comprises the steps of: mapping a name of each the selectable printer status objects expressed in the printer management language native to the printer to a corresponding user friendly name (fig. 3); and displaying the corresponding user friendly name for each of the selectable printer status objects.

Office Action, page 4.

Applicants are perplexed as to how FIG. 3 as pointed to by the Office Action actually shows the displaying of a name of the printer status object in a management language native to the printer. The language used is not described in a language native to the printer. Also, given that the names described such as "ink low" or "out of paper" or "service" are described, it does not necessarily mean that such names are mapped to corresponding names expressed in the management language native to the printer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that *Hemstreet* fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claims 7 and 8.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-8 be withdrawn as depending from claim 1. Also, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 be withdrawn at least for the additional reasons provided above.

In addition, Applicants note that independent claims 9, 10, 16, 20, and 21 include elements similar in scope of that of claim 1 above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn for the same reasons as described above with respect to claim 1 to the extent such reasons apply. In addition, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-15 and 17-19 be withdrawn as depending from claims 10 or 16, respectively. In addition, Applicants further assert that the rejection of claims 11-15 and 17-19 must be withdrawn for the same reasons described above respective to selected ones of claims 2-8 as set forth above.

## CONCLUSION

It is requested that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this Response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel of Applicant.


Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. D'Aurelio/

_____

Michael J. D'Aurelio
Registration Number: 40,977


**Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, L.L.P.**
100 Galleria Parkway, N.W.
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Phone: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933